

REMARKS

The Office action dated November 1, 2006, has been carefully reviewed and the foregoing amendment has been made in response thereto.

Claims 1, 4, and 21-23 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Barry (US 6,851,688). Claims 1, 21 and 22 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hynds et al (US 5,186,486) in view of Kluting (US 5,501,421).

The Office action states that Claims 6, 7, 24, and 25 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In this response, claim 1 has been amended to incorporate all of the limitations of allowable Claim 7, and the intervening Claim 4. Claims 4 and 6 have been canceled, and Claim 7 has been amended to depend from Claim 1.

Claim 21 has been amended to incorporate all of the limitations of allowable Claim 24 and intervening Claim 23. Claims 23 and 24 have been canceled, and Claim 25 has been amended to depend from Claim 21.

The claims remaining in this application appear now in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Frank G. McKenzie
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 29,242

Dated: November 14, 2006
MacMillan, Sobanski & Todd, LLC
One Maritime Plaza, Fourth Floor
720 Water Street
Toledo, Ohio 43604
(734) 542-0900
(734) 542-9569 (fax)

-7-

(Serial No. 10/641,769)